

Early Intervention Planning Council  
September 12, 2007  
Minutes

**Members present:**

Christina Ball  
John Brandon  
Doris Clark  
Taren Duncan

**Members not present:**

Rhonda Allen  
Lonnell Conley  
Patricia Jones  
John Kennedy  
Judge Marilyn Moores  
Marilyn Pfisterer

**Staff present:**

Eric Wright  
Wolfgang Bielefeld  
Tom Stucky  
Lyndy Kouns  
Kari Christensen  
Courtney Federspiel

The meeting was convened at 8:10 am.

John Brandon: In the absence of our Chair, Rhonda Allen, I'll call this meeting of the Marion County Early Intervention Planning Council to order. Welcome everybody this morning and thanks for coming out. We'll proceed through our agenda as it's published without the benefit of voting. You've all received copies of both July and August minutes. Are there any corrections or additions that need to be made to either of those documents? We can do that. Hearing none, I will presume there are no additions to be made or changes. Our next item on the agenda is to review the draft agency survey tool. Dr. Wright?

Eric Wright: You have before you the working draft, which you also got by e-mail and I just want to introduce a couple of people just so you are aware. We invited Professor Wolf Bielefeld from SPEA, an expert in Social Analysis and who has done similar kinds of studies in the past so he joins Professor Tom Stuckey, who has also been working on the Crime Prevention Task Force, and I and Laura Littlepage who is unable to be here today. Also in the back we have Kari Christenson and Courtney Federspiel both of whom are new graduate students who are working with us this year on this project so these are faces you'll see. And Lyndy Kouns who is stepping in for Laura today is also probably going to be the Field Manager of the survey process once we get into the field sometime

in October. So basically the point of today's agenda on this particular item was to discuss ideas or comments. You also received a copy of the draft of the roster of agencies we could contact. I should also report that we did meet with JDAI and spoke with them about some of the data collection processes that they are putting into place and actually they are very excited about the survey ideas as well so they are taking a very close look at it and going to be adding questions as well. And we also met with Connect 2 Help at the United Way and they're also going to be working with us on this to help populate. There's some data that is normally not readily available that's sort of deeper in their system that we're going to be able to access to augment some of the data stuff that we're planning to collect. So we're trying to bring a bunch of players together to think about this in a more comprehensive way so that when we get these data we'll have a very useful tool that multiple agencies would have, basically to be able to use. So, with that, this is not the final shot in terms of comments. We're still working on this but wanted to give everyone the opportunity now that we've had, since our last meeting, some time to think about it, if they've had some thoughts about other items they'd like to see added.

John Brandon: How will the survey be conducted? Will it be a face to face, one on one, or will it be by web? How do you envision that taking place?

Eric Wright: We'll probably be doing, I think we talked a little about, a two level survey. One will be what we call the agency questionnaire which will probably go to the CEO of the agency and that person will probably fill out things like the financial information, the basic staffing stuff. That we can see doing in face to face interviews although in my experience it's better when those are mailed and it's done that way. We'll definitely give them a web option. People seem to like that a lot now. But we are also going to do face to face interviews with program staff and so the idea would be if an agency runs six programs, we would interview basically the heads or the people who know what is going on in the front lines in each of the programs. So that way we would have both an agency overview as well as an individual program overview. Those would actually be administered in person by actually Courtney and all those folks back there as well as a bunch of other graduate students we plan to hire to do this. Any other questions?

John Brandon: Questions or comments? As you look through the survey, are there areas that you feel that need to be covered that are somehow not included in the questions that are here, additional data that you feel would be helpful for the survey to gather?

Eric Wright: Just remind everybody about the purpose. We have been talking all along about the lack of information, about looking at the assessment capacities. So the topics here are organized in a couple of big chunks. One is the basic information about the program, much of which we may be able to prepopulate through the Connect 2 Help system. The other part is to get a more detailed sense about the services they are providing and targeting the age groups. If you remember when we started this conversation we had the theoretical continuum so our hope is then to code those information into the continuum so we can begin to identify empirically where the gaps are in the system currently. The other part is to begin to look at how the different agencies are connected to each other in terms of referral patterns, exchange of resources,

exchange of information. So the idea is really to get a better sense of what, who the players are in the system but then also to better understand how the system is operating. So we do have some room here I think to add some questions about attitudes so a couple of the questions related to some of the proposals we've been developing about their willingness to participate in the strategic planning process, coordinated development efforts - - those kinds of things, will also be included.

John Brandon: I know as I reviewed it, it really looked very comprehensive. I thought that this, I hope and believe, will get the agencies to cooperate. This is going to give us information that will be extremely, extremely helpful.

Eric Wright: And again, the long term function has really two goals. One is to begin to develop the database about agencies that basically can be used by frontline case managers so we can understand the nature of programs that are being offered. That'll all be fed in. A conversation we haven't had with Connect 2 yet is sort of how this database might interface with their database but we also learned in the course of these conversations that apparently the city, or rather IMPD, had developed a database with, you know about this, the Vista volunteers that had actually started this process doing a similar project so one thing we might build on what they laid the foundation for. But what was interesting is there is a perceived clear need to do this, at least on the front line stuff. So I think we'll be able to do that. But it'll also then have a very clear strategic planning process in terms of understanding the way the system is and feed right into our planning process.

John Brandon: Great. Any other comments or questions about the survey? Good. So then the goal is to begin this in October, right?

Eric Wright: Assuming we get all the pieces together we are hoping to start fielding this in late October, I would think is reasonable. We also have to apply for IRB approval, the Institutional Review Board at the University which can be sometimes a challenging process but we'll definitely work on that and we are starting that process but we also want to finalize the instrument and run it around to various parties so that everybody is comfortable with the instrument. So maybe November. But we're shooting for October, early November, somewhere in there to start, with a goal of having data collected by January so we can start the analysis process.

John Brandon: Great. The update on analysis of child welfare funding sources.

Eric Wright: I am happy to report that John Neal will actually have the report completed for the October meeting so that'll be our major focus of the October meeting. It will help us frame some of the questions that Mr. Burrow asked in January and February, get that information so we'll be able to put that forward and I think that'll give us a nice foundation for thinking of strategies for funding of the expansion and early intervention services so that'll be a great addition to the series of reports we've completed.

John Brandon: Discussion of the EIPC plan you have in your packets.

Eric Wright: You have actually both drafts, the two draft plans that were put forward. I just want to remind everybody the history. I know not everybody was privy to the extensive history but in January we finished basically what we thought was the first draft of the plan. That is the document that's actually dated now at the bottom 9/5/2007 but it was actually finalized in early February after our January meeting. And in that plan we began outlining what we thought were the key tasks that needed to be accomplished. If you remember there were two main goals there. One was to expand the community based system but one of the features of that was in fact on the coordinating council, or the coordinating agency idea, governing body. The second major goal was to expand mental health services. And so those two were the major goals and foundation of the plan. We put this forward to the City-County Council and we basically had a conversation about it and it didn't really seem to grab a hold of anybody's attention at the time so we were given some instructions to think more seriously about financial issues which is what prompted the whole financial study which you'll see the results of next month. In the process of that, though, the conversation acknowledged the fact that if we wanted anything before the City-County Council this year we would need to have the proposal prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> and so we basically pulled that component of the project out of the plan into a separate proposal which is the draft that is dated 6/15/07. That proposal was circulated to the City-County Council and in the last couple of weeks I've actually had a lot of meetings about this particular proposal and the City-County Council is generally, it sounds, in favor or supportive of this concept. They were a little concerned about specifying a specific agency as to be the lead agency and that we should leave it more open-ended. So one of the reasons to bring this back was they actually wanted us to develop the other part of the plan more thoroughly. So, what I'm suggesting here is, we're not necessarily back to the drawing board but in fact I think what we've been given is direction to go back to this earlier plan and develop it more, flush it out a little more and so I just wanted to update everybody that's where we are. Use basically the work we've already contributed to this and I think a lot of the stuff we've done in the last couple months will feed into this and give some more specific funding recommendations. It's not altogether clear to me whether the City-County Council will be in a position to do anything this year given some of the other fiscal issues they're trying to address but we're still somewhat optimistic that they may be able to do something with the coordinating council idea if we repackage this proposal. So, the reason I mention this is because we have these two big issues that we're trying to address in the original plan so what we're doing is we decided to chunk out this first part so what the staff is going to be doing this month is basically working to finalize or develop this 6/14 proposal a little more, taking out the specification of a specific agency as the identified agency to do this work and properly identify some sort of application process which probably would mean that the EIPC would have to evaluate the proposals to take on this job. It would mean that the budget might be a little bit more difficult to specify because we wouldn't necessarily know how the proposal would look coming in. But they've asked us to do that and we'll take that forward to the City-County Council hopefully in this same budget cycle. So, once that happens, our hope would be to finish finalizing the development of the larger proposal over the next few months with the goal of having that proposal pretty much flushed out by the end of the year. So, just to recap, what we are going to do is flush out the first piece and go back to the larger proposal, or plan, and begin to develop that. I also

wanted to bring one of the proposals that was raised a long time ago which I want to put forward for conversation, the concept of basically an early intervention reception center. I hate to use that word but in fact the Juvenile Justice system is grabbing hold of the same kind of concept, where in fact we might have a neighborhood based program where parents or children who have problems before they ever hit Juvenile Justice or Special Education, or any of the other systems for that matter, would have an opportunity to call and get some help. We've been sort of bouncing around the idea. We came up with the idea of, I think the idea was in fact to actually have an agency that we dedicated to early intervention and case management, sort of link families at very early stages. You remember in our epidemiological analysis we identified that there are about 40,000 kids that are probably at need, meaning our definition of having one of the four identified risk factors. And if you compare that to the numbers that are already in DCS, in Juvenile Justice, there's a significant number of individuals even at that high level of need who are not being served in any of our current systems. So our thought is if we can figure out a system that would support those families that that would be way of preventing those kids who are already at high risk from ending up in DCS or in Juvenile Justice. So the idea that got floated a long time ago was to create some sort of case management function that would be more open-ended and designed for really at risk children and families. So the proposal I would add is that in addition to the goals that we've laid out here, which is also implied in the recommendation 1:1 under Goal 1. No, that was actually in the original version. In December we had a couple of other recommendations under Goal 1, one which was to establish this agency that would provide this case management function and one of the barriers that we confronted in that conversation was in fact the fiscal issues of about how much would it cost and I think we are in a position to be able to estimate how much it would cost to run such an agency and put that forward. I don't think that's something that would be easily discussed in this current budget cycle but I think what our goal here would be is to flush this out, develop it more, propose it for the next year and begin to lay the foundation of what that agency would do and look like. So I guess I'm putting it out there and asking for your guidance on whether it'd be ok to go back to that original idea and develop it further as a piece of this revised plan.

John Brandon: Taren, don't we somewhat have that with the NACS model that's already in existence and can we look at an expansion of NACS – Neighborhood Alliance for Childhood Safety - as a way to begin, it's doing some of that, and perhaps if we increased the capacity. You might talk about that.

Taren Duncan: As you were speaking, everything you said put me in mind of NACS. It is a case management and referrals can come from families calling in, schools, community, anybody. And what they do is they just go out and try to meet the needs of the family in the neighborhood. Right now there are four NACS offices - north, south, east, and west of the city and so I would say maybe what we need to do is when we are looking at this is looking at maybe expanding that ability of those offices in those areas.

Eric Wright: I think that's perfectly consistent. In fact I think we did talk about this when we first started, John you may remember as well, thinking about this. I think the one thought was by expanding, I think some people were wondering whether NACS had the

capacity to put a lot more agencies out there or whether we should say link NACS with community centers, neighborhood associations, build a network of facilities but I think these are all things we can think through and develop. Actually, we'll reach out and sit down with NACS and maybe talk to them about how they could see themselves expanding and incorporate that as we build the recommendations.

John Brandon: I think that fits in nicely with also the work the Department of Child Services is doing in terms of doing a better job of reaching out and engaging community services. I think that someone who can build that network would be a critically important role.

Taren Duncan: Absolutely, I agree.

Doris Clark: What are the professional components of those, I'm not familiar with NACS, what are the professional components? Who's involved in case management?

Taren Duncan: Each of the offices has social workers that actually work with the families. That's who NACS actually employs, is social workers that go out and work with families. What they do is they hook up families with different resources in the neighborhoods and what they've done is, by having those four separate offices, they have developed and put together a list and all the information about what is available in that neighborhood or what needs to be brought into that neighborhood. They also advocate for different types of services to come into the neighborhoods. So it's very neighborhood specific. Very focused on the needs of the specific families in a specific area.

Doris Clark: OK. The only thing I was thinking about when you mentioned that is professional counseling. Maybe a Social Psychologist and it doesn't have to necessarily be one in each center but just by employing that professional side probably would help, especially since it's the process of before something actually happens with the child, the fact that there's a symptom which is really early intervention.

Eric Wright: So, you were thinking to perhaps expanding their intervention model?

Doris Clark: Yes.

Eric Wright: OK. We can certainly talk about that with them.

John Brandon: Any other comments or suggestions for the staff as they begin to flush this out and add some more meat to the bones? It sounds like a good plan? Everybody feels pretty comfortable about what Dr. Wright has outlined here as the way to move forward?

Doris Clark: I think it's excellent.

John Brandon: OK.

Eric Wright: So we will move forward on that and you will probably have a draft certainly of the non-profit coordinating agency piece of the proposal by the October meeting, perhaps even a draft of the other piece, depends on how soon we can meet with some of these agencies.

John Brandon: OK. Thank you. The next item on the agenda is the discussion of long-term role and operation of the Early Intervention Planning Council.

Eric Wright: One of the things that has come up in the conversations that I've been having with the City-County Councilors has been what their vision of the EIPC was and how the EIPC has evolved or developed over these past first year and a half. I think one of the things that was clear to me in this conversation was the need to begin thinking about what the long term role of this is. I'll say that one of the things that I was told was that the City-County Council really saw this body as having a significant authority role in the county with the goal of trying to provide planning and coordination but also being the go-to body for them to be able to come to and say we have a problem with children in Marion County so what do we need to do about it. And I think one thing, an action item, I wanted to bring to your attention because it prompted a conversation. In fact, you've actually been asked to present again to the Rules and Policy Committee on October 9<sup>th</sup> and you're going to be getting an invitation to attend that meeting. I unfortunately have to teach that night so they are going to put us first on the agenda. I promised them I would start my class late that evening but they would also like to have a couple of other EIPC members there, present for the meeting, in case they have questions. Particularly after I go to teach my class, so you could all talk about this. I think one of the things we are hoping to do this fall is to begin to clarify that and what the role of the EIPC is. So it's more of an information item at this point. One of the key questions is what is the role of us. We've been sort of the convenor, or facilitator, of this process and one of the things that we have not discussed at all is what happens when our contract ends, which technically is next April. How would this body continue to function and facilitate the conversation for the long haul. I think this is a great opportunity and I wanted people to begin to think about this and how we wanted to perceive that. We are happy to continue to be involved but obviously there are some costs associated with that and I think we just need to have a conversation about that. Maybe today's not a good day since we don't have as many of the folks here as we could. I just wanted to raise this and to acknowledge that you'll be getting this invitation to the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting to the Rules and Policy because they wanted to look at this more closely because I think perhaps they were hoping we would have made a lot more progress in the year and a half we've been operating than perhaps we may have. Although when I outlined all the accomplishments we've actually done to date, we actually have accomplished quite a bit. But I think what they are hoping for is that we move the system along a lot faster and I think all of us in the system would acknowledge that this is a very large ship and it's moving at 30 knots at least and we're trying to change the direction of the ship which is not an easy task. So I reminded them that what we're talking about are not doing short term fixes but thinking more long term. I feel very proud of the outline of the plan we've laid in because we're talking about fundamental structural changes and again I think we need to think about that because that means what is the role of the EIPC in monitoring, guiding, that ship as it

starts to make a turn in the next few years. So I just wanted to bring that to everybody's attention. Anybody have any preliminary thoughts?

John Brandon: Do you have any idea of what they mean by the phrase "significant authority"?

Eric Wright: No.

John Brandon: Because in my mind "significant authority" means that you have to invest, somebody has to invest, that authority in this body. And I'm not quite sure who that is.

Eric Wright: I did in fact raise that question and that is raising all sorts of other questions that are under discussion now. One of the key challenges that I think we face, in which we recognized at some level at the beginning of this process, is that in fact when you think about the different institutions that are represented at this table, they often have different groups they have to report to so the question about where the authority falls has raised some questions about whether this raises larger elite statutory issues that we need to address more frankly. So one possibility would be that one of the key challenges here is how the state and county relate to one another around child welfare issues, generally speaking. And so, one of the questions that we're probably going to have to grapple with as we think about the long term role of the EIPC is whether or not we want to suggest to the City-County Council a restructuring of that relationship, which might require longer term legislation action, but rethinking how we might be able to do our business more effectively. I think one of the challenges we face is basically the way the system is set up, the county is responsible for collecting the money for child welfare but then the state spends the money for child welfare. And that disconnect has created a lot of tension between the state and the county. It also makes it hard to coordinate a lot of the other activities, especially when we bring people like yourself, John, the non-profit sector to the table. How do we steer that ship when we have two groups, two briggs if you will, moving the ship. I think one question then which has become crystallized through these series of conversations is what we want to do about that. I guess what I would entertain, one proposal has been, that we advocate with the City-County Council that maybe we should think about going to the legislature and asking for structural change in the way the state and county relate to one another. Either give the county more authority and vest not only the fiscal responsibility for collecting these funds but also managing these funds. Or basically asking the state to take over the responsibility for collecting the funds and managing the funds. So I guess I'd be curious, again we have limited numbers of individuals here, but where people think about that.

John Brandon: I mean, clearly those are significant issues that have to be grappled with. I think there's some sense that one of the things that folks would be loath to lose is some sort of local say about how our dollars are expended and how actions are taken by the counties in the system. If we completely turn it over to the control of the state then folks are going to say "Wait a minute, what happens to our local say so here?" I think there's some concern about that.

Doris Clark: I would say the language of authority almost indicates some kind of legislative action. I mean just by virtue of saying “give you authority”, that’s the only way you are going to get it.

Eric Wright: I think it’s even more fundamental when we actually focus on the early intervention and prevention piece. Because when you think about that piece specifically and ignore everything else, those are provided by non-governmental organization or non-profit over whom the city or county has very limited authority to statutorily say this is a non-profit. So one question would be is how far, how much authority, can we exercise over the non-profit and I think we had this conversation in little pieces over the past year and a half and I think we came to the idea that some sort of coordinating body that would be sponsored by the city to facilitate, not necessarily in a stick way, but rather give them a carrot, i.e. a development officer, evaluation person that they might share across that and build a central resource for non-profits to work from, might actually help motivate them to come to the table in a more coordinated way. We’ve been operating under this notion of consensus I think perhaps more than the City-County Council thought we were going to operate under but again I think it raises some statutory questions of where we fall. Maybe we don’t need to have this conversation now but I definitely will be touching base with each of you over the next few weeks to get your input on this and I think one of the things we’ve been asked to do is think about a resolution we might put forward to the City-County Council on the sentiment of this group on how we feel about some of those legislative issues might arise. So as you think about this issue over the next few weeks there might be a whole variety of issues that we want to address at the same time and put forward a series of proposals, some of which may get acted on, some of which may not get acted on but I think anything we can do to clarify our roles vis-à-vis the city and the county would be really helpful. One specific suggestion which we’ve put forward I should mention. We now have three vacancies. Mr. Burrow has resigned from the EIPC and Rhonda’s elevation to Director, so we haven’t replaced her when she was Assistant Deputy Director so I think Taren has been pitch-hitting for now. And we put forward a few names. Dr. Gillenwaters is also retired from IPS so we’ve asked for a replacement because the statute says we have to have a rep from the largest school district in Indianapolis which is IPS so we need to have someone from IPS. So we have three vacancies and I’ve been working with them to identify individuals so hopefully they’ll be appointed prior to our October meeting which by the way is October 10<sup>th</sup>, the morning after the October 9<sup>th</sup> so you’ll work late and come early. Sorry about that but that’s the schedule. So we have those three vacancies but if you remember, one of the other things we put forward was a request to expand the membership of this group to include a Deputy Mayor and a representative from the City Comptroller’s office to help pull the fiscal administrative pieces into the conversation. And that’s being actively considered. That would require the City-County Council going back and amending the ordinance that actually enabled the EIPC so there’s some political issues there that need to get worked through their normal process. So I’m going to do a formal presentation about what we’ve accomplished and some of the issues that come up hopefully at the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting and then they’ll probably engage in a lot of Q&A about where we are. And one thing, I think you got an e-mail, and one of the attachments was actually a revised timeline of activities. Does that look familiar? It wasn’t in this packet so I don’t think we have copies

available. But we have developed a new timeline that reflects our role and what we expect to accomplish over the next few months, including finishing these pieces of the plan, the survey, writing a final report on the survey and leading up to what we hope will be the adoption of the official full-fledged plan sometime early spring. And then the fiscal recommendations on how to move forward. That's our timeline. You didn't get that.

John Brandon: No.

Eric Wright: You're not looking like you didn't. I'll make sure you get a copy of that so you know what we're thinking.

John Brandon: OK, great. That would be helpful. Any other comments, questions? The last item of our agenda is possible recommendations of resolution recommending the restructuring of child welfare funding.

Eric Wright: Which we sort of already did.

John Brandon: Yes, we sort of covered in the discussion. Which will also, I'm sure, be part of John's report in October? Will that be part of that or is that something separate from that?

Eric Wright: I think that will actually inform that at least the preliminary findings are probably not surprising to a lot of people. But I think one of the things that was an operating philosophy around the way a lot of people have been thinking is if we are going to invest in preventing, early intervention, we have to figure out a way of reducing expenditures in other parts of the system. And so we can shift funds if you will. And this is why it is raising restructuring questions because right now the way the results are looking is most funds are locked up in pretty tight silos and there's not a lot of wiggle room. Rhonda I think mentioned that even in the child welfare budget, that is statutorily defined, there's only \$200,000 in the DCS budget for prevention activities and where would you get other funds even within existing child welfare. So the preview of the report is we have a lot of money floating around the system but it tends to be locked up and dictated by statutory limitations. One of the things I think we are going to have to address is how do we find more money to invest in prevention and early intervention which are things everybody says we should but they aren't covered under statutory funding allocations. That's one of the challenges here because one could argue, a theory has been floated, that if we were to be able to consolidate all the county dollars into one pot we could move monies around a little more flexibly than they would be under the current structure. Again that would have implications for the state and the county in the way they've done business for quite a few years that's part of the parcel. The report in October will have some good news and bad news in spending money and there's a lot of money in the system so we are doing a lot in the child welfare side generally speaking but it's also going to be the bad side, we have a lot of limitations we have to work within when it comes to funding sources. That's the preview of that so I think it will fit into the conversation nicely at the October meeting.

John Brandon: Have members of the planning council – some folks were at the budget presentation – I wonder if it would be helpful for folks to get a copy of the budget presentation. Do you think? At least the preliminary budget that was presented to the Council by DCS and Juvenile Court. It might just be an interesting reference source for folks on the Council to have in their hands to look at so at least they know what the request was and how these dollars are projected to be spent over the next year.

Taren Duncan: I can send that electronically. Do you want me to send it to you?

Eric Wright: Yes, you can send it to me and I'll send it back out to everybody on the server.

John Brandon: Because I think Rhonda and the Judge did an excellent job of making the presentation to the Committee. So it's been about a month or so ago but it just might be helpful information for folks to have. Do we have further business to be brought before the body? If not, I would say that the September meeting of the Committee is over. Thank you all for coming. Appreciate your help and input. Good work by the staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 am.